



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/505,292	04/11/2005	Christopher P. Parle	7095CEL-1	5274
22442	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
SHERIDAN ROSS PC			GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL	
1560 BROADWAY			ART UNIT	
SUITE 1200			PAPER NUMBER	
DENVER, CO 80202			3749	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/505,292

Applicant(s)

PARLE ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen Gravini

Art Unit

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-26 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20050411.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Aylor et al. (US 6,088,931).

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hamrin (WO 92/18693).

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Cojafex (NL 1 383 364).

Claims 15-19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Khachatryan et al. (SU 1112007).

Claims 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Zellerman (US 3,289,679).

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Hollman et al. (US 4,541,442).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 3749

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aylor in view of Zellerman. Aylor is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed curved quartz tube. Zellerman, another IR emitter, is considered to disclose a curved quartz tube on the face of that reference wherein the tubular bulbous shape is the same as the claimed curved quartz tube. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Aylor with the curved quartz tube, considered disclosed by Zellerman, for the purpose of allowing an object to be dried that is of a curved surface.

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khachatryan in view of Katz. Khachatryan is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed removable barrier wheel. Katz, another IR emitter, is considered to disclose a removable barrier wheel at column 3 lines 35-62 wherein the removability feature is implied since one would need to remove the barrier wheel for any type of deconstruction and reconstruction. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Khachatryan with the

Art Unit: 3749

removable barrier wheel, considered disclosed by Katz, for the purpose of allowing a desirable construction means for liberality of manufacturing.

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khachatryan in view of Cojafex. Khachatryan is considered to disclose the claimed invention, as rejected above, except for the claimed water cooled arc gripping means. Cojafex, another IR emitter, is considered to disclose a water cooled arc gripping means on page 2 line 113 through page 3 line 25. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Khachatryan with the water cooled arc gripping means, considered disclosed by Cojafex, for the purpose of preventing deformation in obtaining a bending article and allow employing machines of lighter construction.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on 571 272 4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3749

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG
March 10, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Stephen Gromi". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.